

February 7, 1969

sential, we would not object to an extension of up to six months.

Sincerely,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1968.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand that during today's Subcommittee hearing on H.R. 17874 there was discussion of the Bureau's report of September 4, 1968, and that the question arose as to our view concerning a brief extension of the period cited in that legislation rather than deferral of legislative action as recommended in our report.

We continue to prefer deferral for reasons outlined in the September 4th report. However, if the Committee believes an extension covering the period of further study is essential, we would not object to an extension of up to six months.

Sincerely,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,
Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference.

SEPTEMBER 4, 1968.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Hearings have been scheduled for September 5, on H.R. 17874, a bill which would extend by an additional fifteen years the period during which the State of Alaska may select Federal lands which are already under lease, permit, license or contract under the Mineral Leasing Act.

You may recall that the Department of the Interior has sent to your Committee a report favoring a five-year extension. We had previously concurred in a similar Interior report to the Senate Committee on S. 3406, an identical bill. However, a number of developments have caused us to wish to consider further several aspects of matters dealt with by this legislation.

The rapid pace of mineral exploration and the large oil strike on the North Slope of Alaska in particular lend emphasis to the tremendous significance of Federal mineral and land policies. We have been discussing with the Department of the Interior the need for a general appraisal and review of these policies. The Public Land Law Review Commission study of revenue sharing and the related Department of Interior analysis of mineral leasing act sharing will provide information useful in this review.

In the circumstances, we would appreciate opportunity to reconsider our position on H.R. 17874 with the objective of making a specific recommendation on the legislation early in the next session of the Congress. The Department of the Interior concurs in this request. Accordingly, we recommend that the Committee defer action on this legislation until the next session of the Congress.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Deputy Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it will be noted that in Mr. Zwick's reply he states:

We understand that the Department of Interior will reply to the technical questions (1 through 3) in your letter. We will not repeat that information here.

Notwithstanding the fact that my letter as addressed to Secretary Udall was also dated October 29 and that between that date and January 20 I was prom-

ised on repeated occasions that the Secretary's reply had been prepared and was awaiting his signature, I regret to report that to date I have not received an answer.

I cannot understand why the Secretary of the Interior was not more interested in replying to these questions since they now all admit that millions of prospective Government revenue are involved in the decision that may be made on this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of October 29 as addressed to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, be printed at this point in the RECORD. His failure to reply should be noted by the Interior Committee should any thought be given to considering this question at this session of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 29, 1968.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the closing days of the session S. 3406 was left on the Senate Calendar without any action being taken. This is the bill introduced by Senator Bartlett and Senator Gruening, the purpose of which was to extend the time for the filing of applications for the selection of certain lands by the State of Alaska to fifteen years.

In the Committee Report the Departments are quoted as having endorsed this proposal; however, I note that the endorsements of the respective agencies appear prior to the recent discovery of a major oil field in that area. I am therefore asking for a new report from your Department as to how the enactment of this bill would affect the position or equity of the United States Government. Does the Interior Department still recommend its enactment upon the convening of the next Congress?

In addition to stating the position of your Department I would appreciate answers to the following questions:

1. The effective date of the charter granting Alaska statehood, along with both effective and expiration dates of the rights extended to that state for claiming certain acreage.

(a) The number of acres allocated to the state under this option.

(b) A record of all extensions or modifications of this agreement along with the expiration date of the final agreement.

2. Was there a special agreement on mineral leases outstanding at the time Alaska was admitted to statehood and how were they affected by these options?

(a) How would they be affected by an extension of the dates as proposed in S. 3406?

3. Were the recent major discoveries of oil fields in the Alaskan Region made on government-owned or state-claimed lands and were they government or state leases?

(a) If government lands or leases from the government, give the dates.

4. Would the enactment of this legislation extending the filing date permit the state to claim any of these newly discovered oil fields as state lands which otherwise they would not be able to do without the legislation?

5. In what way and to what extent would the enactment of legislation extending this filing date react either favorably or adversely to the interests of the United States Government?

(a) Do you have any estimate as to the amount of revenue involved?

If it is the position of your Department that the enactment of this legislation is favorable to the interests of the United States Government, please explain, or if your Department recommends against the enactment, explain how it would adversely affect the Government's interests. At the same time I would appreciate receiving any additional information which you feel should be considered in making a decision on this legislative proposal.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

CASTRO'S CUBA AFTER 10 YEARS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, more than 10 years ago, in fact, in late December 1958 Fidel Castro and his small guerrilla force of fighting men came out of the Sierra Maestra Mountains, which had been their base for some years, in their hit-and-run fighting against the dictatorial regime of Fulgencio Batista. On January 1, 1959, Fidel Castro and his small force of fighting men entered Havana and paraded down the main thoroughfare. The tumultuous welcome of more than a million men, women, and children crowding throughout the broad avenues of Havana shouting and weeping for joy was so tremendous, enthusiastic, and expressed so much happiness and relief as to be almost beyond belief.

For years preceding this time a former sergeant of the Cuban Army, Fulgencio Batista, had been in power, not by election, but by force and violence. For years preceding this New Year's Day dictator Batista had ruled Cuba with its 7 million population as his own fiefdom. His had been a cruel, corrupt dictatorial regime. New York racketeers had arranged with him to operate the gambling houses and casinos of Havana, and that beautiful city had become the vacation center of the Western Hemisphere and the gambling mecca bringing in shiploads of pleasure-seeking vacationers along with gangsters and racketeers from New York who controlled the gambling syndicate. All the time Sergeant Batista, dictator of this beautiful island in the Caribbean, was depositing in his secret Swiss bank accounts the millions he took in during his years in power by crushing his own people into further oppression with taxes and corruption that was rampant throughout all Cuba and from huge sums he skimmed from the gambling tables.

Then, on that New Year's Day he suddenly and secretly left for Europe to join his Swiss bank account. Throughout the years since that time he has been enjoying the good life and sun on the French Riviera and at his luxurious villa in Spain.

At the time of the triumph of Fidel Castro it was said that administration leaders and our Central Intelligence Agency were overwhelmed with surprise over the sudden turn of events. To me that always seemed peculiar. It happened that I was vacationing in Florida the latter half of December having dissolved my law firm. It seemed well known in Key West, Miami Beach, and Palm

February 7, 1969

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S1469

Beach among those with whom I talked that the guerrillas had won the war in Cuba and that Batista would either be executed or exiled within a few days. County and State officials in Florida with whom I talked and also many in private life knew the facts. Finally the CIA and officials of the Eisenhower administration learned what had been common knowledge in Florida.

During the intervening 10 years our relationship with dictator Castro and members of his regime has been most unsatisfactory. In fact, sometimes stormy and grim.

President Eisenhower in January 1961 severed our diplomatic relations with the Cuban Government. Our Embassy in Havana was closed. Our Ambassador and members of his staff returned immediately to the United States.

Unfortunately for this Nation, and in my judgment to our prejudice, we have been since that time compelled to deal with Cuban officials through members of the staff of the Swiss Embassy. We thereby lost our own listening post and open window to all that has gone on in Cuba during the past 10 years.

Of course, what has gone on in this little island close to Key West, Fla., has generally speaking become known to us. Unfortunately, there have been delays in acquiring precise knowledge. This was made clearly evident to all Americans in October of 1962 and at some other periods.

Immediately following the time our Government severed all diplomatic relations with Cuba and placed reliance upon the Swiss Embassy to look after our interests, Fidel Castro's Cuban Government confiscated the property of American corporations and individuals and there was considerable financial loss involved. Whether such procedure would have been followed by the Cuban Government had we not severed diplomatic relations is a matter for argument.

Then there was the missile crisis of 1962 and our blockade of Cuba and an eyeball to eyeball confrontation between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. Khrushchev blinked. The missiles were withdrawn. War was averted.

Also, there was the horrendous blunder of our CIA training Cubans and some Americans in Guatemala for an invasion of Cuba and liberation of its people from the Castro rule. The abortive Bay of Pigs invasion took place. Some Americans were killed, hundreds of Cubans killed and taken prisoner. The poorly planned invasion was crushed. Then our Government paid a huge ransom in medical supplies to secure the release from imprisonment of some hundreds taken prisoner in that invasion. Even today, thousands of Cuban refugees are being maintained at the expense of our Government while they are no doubt plotting further invasions.

Almost daily we read of hijacking incidents. Unfortunately we have no embassy nor staff in Havana but are dependent on the Swiss to make protests to the Cuban Government. This is illustrative of the fact that we have been prejudiced through these years because we lack means of direct communication with the Government.

We might as well face the fact that apparently the present Cuban regime is firmly entrenched. To our knowledge no rebellion nor guerrilla warfare is being waged against Fidel Castro and his government.

It appears that of all the 7 to 8 million men, women, and children living in Cuba, an overwhelming majority are better off physically and financially than they were 10 years ago, and from all the knowledge we Americans are able to acquire an overwhelming majority of these Cuban people do support and uphold the present administration. I express regret over the fact that Fidel Castro does have the support of a huge majority of his people, but we should not be blind to the facts.

The Castro regime is totalitarian. It is Communist. The regime of Fulgencio Batista was totalitarian. It was fascist. Communist dictators and fascist dictators govern by decree. The voice of the people of countries so misgoverned are not heard nor are their votes tolerated. Surely the regime of Fidel Castro and its operations are abhorrent to freedom-loving men and women of our country.

Very definitely, to speak for a moment regarding Western Hemisphere nations, the fascist militarist regimes of Brazil, the Argentine Republic, and now Peru, are abhorrent to freedom-loving citizens everywhere. Yet, at the time in the Argentine Republic, so-called, the generals overthrew the duly elected President and sent him into exile, we did not break diplomatic relations with Argentina. When the generals of the Brazilian Army by a midnight coup overthrew the President of that great nation, our Government did not sever diplomatic relations with that regime. Now, in recent weeks, the militarists of Peru have ousted the duly elected President. He is exiled from his own country. These fascist generals by decree have expropriated property of American corporations to the extent of many millions of dollars. In our newspapers we read advertisements of the Standard Oil Co., denouncing the fact that the fascist rulers of Peru have seized their property, giving no compensation whatever. Yet we continue to permit American businessmen to sell the products of American factories to all these fascist governments and their nationals, but the products, even medicines, produced in America may not be sold to the Cuban Government nor to Cubans. Americans are barred from visiting Cuba. The Communists, who also govern by decree, have taken over Cuba. Hence diplomatic relations were broken. American businessmen and farmers may not profit with any trade with that country. In those other republics, so-called, of South America—Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, and most recently Peru—where fascist rulers govern by decree, our embassies have not been closed. Trade between Americans and the nationals of those countries has not been barred.

Historically, Athens was the cradle of democracy. Yet when Fascist colonels overthrew the constitutional government in a midnight coup, our Government did not close our Embassy nor

ment continued uninterruptedly to recognize this Fascist regime in Greece.

We have recognized for many years the ruthless and bloodstained tyrant Francois Duvalier whose dictatorship has impoverished the people of Haiti. Haiti is one of the most beautiful islands in the Western Hemisphere. Along the coastal area and inland as one climbs into the beautiful terrain of the Temperate Zone the land is fertile; the jungles are lush. Yet, the ironhanded rule of Duvalier has so impoverished the inhabitants of Haiti that it is the slum of the Western Hemisphere, with the lowest per capita income anywhere in our hemisphere. That iron hand of Duvalier is also a bloodstained hand. Citizens suspected to be hostile to his regime are executed without trial. Still, we recognize this tyrant and have diplomatic relations with his government.

The United States recognizes and supports the Fascist regime of dictator Franco in Spain. In fact, liberty loving Spaniards, now being further oppressed by new censorship and more restrictions recently applied by Franco, claim that except for the support of the United States his regime would have been overthrown years ago.

Our country maintains diplomatic relations with every Fascist regime in the entire world. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with every Communist government in Europe, with the exception of little Albania. The United States maintains diplomatic relations, in fact, with all governments governing by decree and by single party rule except for Albania and Cuba.

It has been said that early in 1959 President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, was at the time advised by our CIA that the Fidel Castro government would topple in a matter of weeks, so he advised President Eisenhower to follow a hard line policy toward the Castro regime—a policy which eventually led to a complete break in diplomatic relations and possibly to many of the crises and difficulties that ensued through the years. Whether that Washington gossip is historically true or not, I do not know.

I do know that depending upon the Swiss Embassy in Havana as our listening post has proven through almost 10 years to be unsatisfactory and inadequate. Let us hope that President Nixon and Secretary of State Rogers will reassess all facets of our relationship with the regime governing Cuba. Very likely for all I know they have already commenced reappraising our policies relating to President Dorticos, of Cuba, and all other officials supporting Fidel Castro. No doubt the contrast as to what we have been doing in dealing with Peru and what we have done in dealing with Cuba has become a matter of concern.

We Americans despise communism. Yet we have no right to direct the people of Cuba as to what sort of government they must maintain any more than we have a right to direct the people of Yugoslavia that they must not have a Communist regime.

The evidence is overwhelming that Cuba has a viable government. This is a

cans generally despise. It is a government, however, that appears firmly in power and has been for a period of 10 years.

Whether or not the tyranny of the present government of Cuba is as bad or as worse than the tyranny and corruption of the Batista government that preceded it, is not a matter to be considered. We do know however that the people of Cuba, those who work in the sugar cane fields and the people crowded in the slums of Havana, Santiago, and other cities, are from all reports better off in every way and enjoy greater contentment and a better life than they had during the Batista regime.

Mr. President, on February 4, 1969, there appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, one of our Nation's great newspapers, a very informative article by James Nelson Goodsell, the Monitor's Latin American correspondent, entitled "Now We Begin the Second 10 Years." In his article, Mr. Goodsell points out that while there is discontent in Cuba, while there are shortages, and while many have not reconciled themselves to the Communist government, for the most part Castro enjoys the allegiance of the great majority of Cubans. He reports that the poor and underprivileged who form the great mass of the population are somewhat better off than they were 10 years ago. In the Wall Street Journal of February 5, 1969, there appeared a front-page article entitled, "Fidel's Experiment, Most Cubans Appear Content With Castro's 10-Year-Old Regime," which confirms Mr. Goodsell's observations and conclusions regarding conditions in Cuba today and the stability of the Castro government.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1969]
FIDEL'S EXPERIMENT: MOST CUBANS APPEAR CONTENT WITH CASTRO'S 10-YEAR-OLD REGIME—JAILS HOLD 10,000 DISSENTERS, BUT IMPROVED EDUCATION, HEALTH, WAGES WIN FAVOR—FREE CALLS ON PUBLIC PHONES
 (By Herbert G. Lawson)

SAN ANDRES, CUBA.—Antonio Toledo, a barefoot, nearly toothless tobacco farmers, warmly greets an American visitor to his dirt-floor home in this remote western mountain valley. A photo of Fidel Castro hangs on one wall, but the family's most cherished possession is a wall rack full of china plates and coffee cups.

"We never had those before the revolution," say Mr. Toledo. "We have more money now." Though he has refused to yield to pressure to give up his land to the state, he's glad to sell his output to the government and notes that it gives him free fertilizer that has quadrupled his crop. His grandchild will go to a free, modern boarding school in the valley. He and his family now have two doctors nearby; before the revolution, medical help for the 8,000 people in the valley was 35 miles away—over a mountain without roads.

Mr. Toledo's enthusiasm for Cuba's 10-year-old Communist regime isn't shared by everyone on this tropical island of eight million people. But Castro's enemies appear far outnumbered by those who fervently or passively accept the revolution. "No matter what happens, capitalism is dead here," asserts one pro-Western diplomat in Havana.

BLAMING FIDEL

A visitor, however, finds some signs of discontent directed at Premier Castro, and U.S. intelligence sources report isolated acts of rebellion. "Fidel gets more personal blame for problems, and there's been more mud splattered on him in the past several years," says one analyst. But most agree that the unrest isn't a serious threat—at least for now—to the Castro government.

But if the 41-year-old Fidel is firmly in the saddle, it is equally apparent that Cuba is susceptible to change. The hallmark of the revolution has been experimentation, and it continues. Nowhere else in the Communist world has Marxism been applied with more free-wheeling exuberance. The result is a Cub of many faces, some of them contradictory and all fascinating.

Havana and the countryside wear a well-scrubbed look. Litter barrels are everywhere and the capital remains the airy city of sun and sea, skyscrapers, broad avenues and tropical flowers that once made it a tourist mecca. Still visible, too, are the slums, but they seem less crowded and far neater than the tenements of Mexico City or New York.

The mood of the country is subdued. One recent Mexican visitor who knew Cuba under the Batista dictatorship compares the two eras: "There are no beggars on the streets and there used to be a great many. But the people aren't as friendly now; they used to stop you on the street and ask how you liked Cuba."

TOURISTS ARE GONE

Most tourists are gone now, unless one counts the Russian technicians who swarm around the swimming pool at Havana's Hotel Nacional or the bearded Americans of the New Left who flock to Cuba despite State Department strictures against such travel. Hotels and other buildings are aging as gracefully as they can in the face of a severe shortage of paint and nearly everything else. Few cars are seen on the streets, though there are plenty of British Leyland buses, trucks and military vehicles.

One face of Cuba is that of austerity. It is a nation where rationing now is more severe than in war-time England and where, even when ration stamps are available, stores are likely to be empty of appliances, most clothes, many food items and all luxury goods.

But there is also a Cuba of the millenium, a place where no one will pay rent beginning next year and where most medical care is free and far more abundant than in the past. Public phones, baseball games, wedding banquets, education and even funerals are on the government. Despite the monotony of the diet, no one is starving, and most people, in fact, appear well fed and reasonably well dressed.

POLITICAL PRISONERS

Another face is autocratic. This is a thoroughly totalitarian state where 2.5 million people—nearly one in three—are members of vigilante groups on nearly every block called Committees for the Defense of the Revolution. No opposition press is tolerated and the jails contain 10,000 or more political prisoners, including former high-level Communists who challenged Castro's leadership. The premier recently gave public support to Russian suppression of the liberal Czech government.

But there is also a more tolerant Cuba where the Catholic Church still functions despite some government restrictions, where students and intellectuals feel some freedom to express anti-Castro views at social gatherings, where artists have Czech-style freedom of expression and where racial integration of the 27% black and mulatto population is genuine. The regime, with a large core of enthusiastic supporters, tries to avoid a police-state atmosphere and prefers the carrot.

Then there is Puritan Cuba. Lotteries and prostitution have been outlawed, night clubs

may open only three nights a week, all other bars are shuttered and Castro recently cracked down on Havana's hippies by rounding up several hundred of them in a sudden downtown street raid. Those that couldn't prove useful employment wound up in work camps in eastern Camaguey Province.

But the sensual Cuba of former times can't be suppressed entirely. The girls of Havana and the countryside prefer short miniskirts and somehow—even when wearing fatigues on militia guard duty—look as if they have just come from a beauty parlor. The love of music in this land of palm trees (especially American rock and roll) is such that the government in December was forced to rescind an early 1968 order for a total close-down of all night clubs and adopt the present three-day-a-week schedule.

And amid all this is a Cuba still full of sights and sounds reminiscent of its earlier strong ties to the U.S. A high official of the government film industry, driving a group of Americans in his Russian-made Volga station wagon, suddenly begins singing "I'm in the Mood for Love." And Cubans still make a soft drink they call Coca-Cola that tastes much like the U.S. product, even though Coke syrup is no longer available from the U.S.

Havana, where nearly one-fourth of all Cubans live, reflects all the contradictions of the revolution. Fidel loves ice cream, formerly a luxury in Cuba, and has decreed that the people should have it in abundance. The result is ice cream everywhere, including at the Coppelia, a two-story cantilevered ice cream parlor in downtown Havana that seats 5,000 and where the customer can choose from 52 flavors, including guava. Five scoops with syrup costs \$1.50, and it's worth it. There are always long lines, despite the fact the Coppelia is open all day and most of the night.

WAITING IN LINE

Meanwhile, no milk is available except for children and the aged. And though Cubans appear to have adequate supplies of staples like rice and beans, many other foods are almost as scarce as milk. At grocery stores and restaurants, there are always long lines. "Someone from each family is constantly in line," complains one young man who lives in Havana.

A visit to Fin de Sigo, a big department store in the old quarter of Havana, is depressing. Long lines of glass merchandise cases are completely empty; the men's department is blocked off, the racks devoid of any clothing. A few bored clerks stand around watching the equally scarce shoppers. The only crowd is in the lingerie department where women line up to buy stockings. Not a single appliance is in sight, nor are there any toys or children's clothing except for cotton school uniforms (\$3.23 for a cheap skirt).

Such shortages—caused by the lackluster performance of Cuba's economy and the diversion of capital into agricultural industry—inevitably cause some unrest. At a party in a private home in Havana, a 20-year-old teacher confides that he would like to flee the country. "I don't believe our government's propaganda," he says. But he can't leave legally under the refugee program while he is of military age. Part of his family already has gone to Miami, and he eagerly watches Miami television (Bewitched is a favorite show).

There are other hints of disenchantment. A university student says her brother recently saw two militiamen shot to death in Oriente Province, the eastern mountain region where there have been persistent reports of antigovernment activity. Other observers report incidents of farm workers deliberately breaking cane seedlings before planting them and of chains being thrown across power lines to short them. "But it's says one. "The security here is too good for there to be any percentage in it."

February 7, 1969

FLEEING CUBA

Nevertheless, Castro was concerned enough to lash out at saboteurs in a major address last September, citing 51 major acts of sabotage, including arson in schools and sugar warehouses.

But analysts of Cuban affairs agree that Castro has dealt effectively with most dangerous citizens by jailing them or, more often, by giving them a chance to leave. More than 600,000 Cuban refugees now live around the world, including 400,000 in the U.S. About 1,000 weekly arrive by air in Miami, and a unknown number flee by various illegal routes. One U.S. source says about 900 have made their hazardous exit by swimming into the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo or jumping its fence. The most spectacular mass flight occurred last month when 87 refugees dashed into the base. An undetermined number of others were killed by Cuban soldiers in the escape attempt.

Would-be refugees who want to follow the normal route face still another of Cuba's long lines, this one at the Swiss embassy in Havana. As soon as they announce their intention to leave by applying at the embassy, they become "gusanos," or worms, in the view of the state. Many lose their jobs and go to farm labor camps while waiting the several years before space is available on a flight out; one embassy source reports 70,000 now are on the waiting list. All who leave Cuba forfeit most of their possessions when they go.

Those who stay behind to build the revolution are resourceful. Mechanics are geniuses in patching up rusty 1950-vintage U.S. cars. Women sew their own clothes from the yearly ration of slightly more than 21 square yards. "No two women in Cuba dress alike," proudly says one government clerk.

WAGE CEILING

The minimum wage here is generally \$85 a month. The sum seems small, but most families include two or more breadwinners because the state is rapidly taking over the job of child-rearing. A maximum wage of \$700 a month is set by the government, but few earn it. Pensions are guaranteed to all at whatever age they become unable to work. The pension is \$60 a month, plus free food, lodging and medical care. Almost everyone works for the state because all businesses are nationalized; however, some 20% to 27% of land remains in the hands of farmers with small acreages. "The tendency is to eliminate this last ownership, but no definite date is set," says a foreign ministry spokesman.

The greatest beneficiaries of the revolution appear to be the rural poor and the young. Youth is worshipped in Castro's Cuba. The head of the information office of the foreign ministry is 26. The schoolmaster at a 300-student boarding school here in San Andres is 20. Teachers are often teen-agers.

Oiga Chamero is a pretty, blond diplomat who, at age 16, went to her first foreign assignment in Colombia. Now 24, she's served in Peking and soon may leave her job as an analyst of U.S. affairs to join Cuba's UN mission. She wears chic clothes and dines occasionally at the several elegant restaurants in Havana largely reserved for diplomats. She also carries a carbine on guard duty and is an ardent revolutionary. "Cubans are free to talk against the revolution but not to act," she says. "We have the right to defend the revolution and we will."

Negroes also are finding a new role in Cuba. Alfonso Herrera, another foreign ministry analyst, recalls that he was the country's first Negro consul, serving in Jamaica in the early 1960s. He was a master builder before the revolution. Although few black Cubans have risen to top government or party posts, they are highly visible in many technical and middle-management jobs, including Cubana Airline pilots.

Even those Negroes with relatively humble jobs say they like the new Cuba. A young woman at the cigar counter of a Havana hotel says she left the island to live in New York for 12 years but returned when the revolution began. "I'm very happy," she says. "Now the country belongs to us and no one can take it away."

GAINS IN MEDICAL CARE

Cubans are especially proud of their new health system. Dr. Albert Sabin, developer of oral polio vaccine, said after a recent visit that health services "are very well organized and vaccine is being carried to the children extraordinarily well." Hospitals have risen in every major city, and hospital beds have more than doubled since the revolution. The bulk of new facilities are in rural areas that had little or no medical care before.

Here in San Andres, where no medical care existed before the revolution, Dr. Antonio Lara and another physician man a tiny "public health post." There is an examination room, a two-bed labor room and a delivery room. Dr. Lara lives at the post and is on call 24 hours daily with six days off each month.

His more serious cases go by ambulance to Pinar del Rio, the provincial capital 35 miles away. There a local party official whips out statistics on medical services in the province: 310 doctors now compared with 226 before the revolution; eight hospitals now against one before ("and it was very bad"); 700 nurses, up from 66 before 1959.

A good measure of overall health care is infant mortality, doctors agree. In Cuba, according to World Health Organization figures, annual infant deaths per 1,000 births are 39.7. This compares with 108.2 in Chile, 91.5 in Guatemala and 62.9 in Mexico. The U.S. rate is 22. The Cuban death rate from gastroenteritis, a major cause of death in Latin America, has also dropped sharply to a level well below most other Latin lands.

FIGHTING ILLITERACY

More controversial than medicine but equally impressive in the view of some observers is the burgeoning school system of Cuba. Castro has declared war on illiteracy and promised his people a free education to the limit of individual ability. The first building to go up in the many new communities dotting the countryside is a schoolhouse. Teachers eager to instill a revolutionary concept of history as well as to turn out trained workers are special heroes of Cuba's revolution.

Here at Integrated School No. 1 in San Andres, 280 primary and secondary students live and study on a modern campus of red-brick buildings. Classroom bells have been replaced by recordings of popular Cuban songs played over a loudspeaker. ("Three Beautiful Cuban Girls" announces the end of class.) The children go home only one Sunday every two weeks. At school, they spend six hours in class work two hours cultivating rice in fields nearby and devote evenings to study, sports or other planned activities. The classrooms are as modern as most in the U.S., and the library is well-stocked, including seven volumes of Karl Marx.

Castro's claim—and it is credible when one sees the masses of uniformed school children throughout the island—is that nearly every educational statistic has doubled under communism. The number of primary and secondary students is now 1,617,000, or more than twice the 781,000 a decade ago, he told an audience at Cangre a few weeks ago.

Cuba's infant film industry is an arm of the educational movement. On a balmy night, 50 citrus growers in a community 30 miles west of Havana gather in a new meeting hall to watch a film brought by a mobile government unit with a portable generator. Such units carry movies to every remote corner of the island.

A LESSON VIA SLAPSTICK

On this particular evening, the citrus growers are treated to a documentary of Fidel's Aug. 23, 1968, speech in defense of the "bitter necessity" for Russia to invade Czechoslovakia. The peasants are impassive during the documentary but break into prolonged laughter at the feature film, a Cuban-made farce called *Death of a Bureaucrat*. It copies a slapstick scene from an old Laurel and Hardy movie while neatly putting over the regime's campaign against red tape.

The primary aim of all Cuban education is to create what Che Guevara, the country's slain guerrilla leader, called the "nuevo hombre." This new man is ill-defined, but everyone talks about him. He is, in Che's poetic description, a Socialist man freed from the "alienation" of modern life. Fidel has described him as the man of the future who will not need or use money or work for any personal gain in "a society free of selfishness."

In practice, many Cubans seem to display sincere zeal in working for their country's goals. But many also seem to submerge their own identity in the process. Octavio Cortaza is a handsome young intellectual who is making his mark as a film director after studying Czech film techniques. When asked how Cubans reacted to the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, he answers: "There was some confusion (in Cuba) at first until we learned what our position would be."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 4, 1969]

NOW WE BEGIN THE SECOND 10 YEARS

(NOTE.—Ten years have passed since Fidel Castro gained power. No one can say they have been peaceful years. In one way or another the Western world has been particularly conscious of Cuba's presence. As to the next 10 years, Cuba watchers wonder whether Dr. Castro will be able to maintain his remarkable staying power.)

(By James Nelson Goodsell)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—Ten years ago Fidel Castro and a small legion of supporters came out of Cuba's Sierra Maestra mountains and took control of the island nation. Neither Cuba nor the Americas have been the same since.

The victory of Dr. Castro in his long struggle against the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista signaled the end of an era, but it was unlike many another government changeover in which a simple change of power took place.

Though it was not clearly seen at the time, Cuba's new leaders determined basically to alter the island's political, economic, and social structure. And in the 10 years since their coming to power, that has been done.

The intervening years have been stormy for Cuba and for the Western Hemisphere—especially for the United States, Cuba's northern neighbor 90 miles across the Florida Straits.

EVENTS RECOUNTED

Events of those years are well known, such as: the gradual worsening of U.S.-Cuban relations and the eventual break in diplomatic ties; Cuba's confiscation of U.S. property; the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion; U.S.-Soviet missile confrontation; Cuba's support for guerrilla activities throughout Latin America; and a host of other incidents which have repeatedly focused attention on the island nation in the Caribbean.

In the process, Premier Castro embraced Marxism and turned his nation's economy into what it has become largely a Communist system.

As such Cuba's long years of economic ties with the U.S. and its capitalistic system have been broken.

There has been a natural turning on the part of Dr. Castro to the Soviet Union and for economic as-

February 7, 1969

Furthermore, it seems clear that the leaders of the Soviet Union seek to disengage themselves from their expensive relationship with Castro's Cuba. This has been costing the U.S.S.R. more than \$1 million a day. To indicate his ingratitude, Castro has supported the Chinese Communists in their bitter and intense ideological battle with the Russians.

Castro continues to support efforts to overthrow Latin American governments. It is apparently a fact that the Cuban Government aided and abetted guerrillas seeking to overthrow the Government of Bolivia and establish a Communist government there. This attempt resulted in disaster for the Cuban leadership. As a condition for recognition and resumption of normal relations between the United States and Cuba, we should demand that the Cuban Government cease any further attempts to subvert the government of any Latin American country. Obviously, were we to have a minister or an ambassador in Cuba with the usual staff we would know almost immediately of any violations of such an agreement.

Why should we continue to officially ignore the Castro regime while Canada, our progressive neighbor to the north, profits from commercial relations with Cuba? The United Kingdom, France, and many other nations have recognized the Government of Cuba now in existence for almost 10 years and have been prospering by their trade with Cuba. We should resume diplomatic relations with Cuba and obtain the same economic benefits through trade and commerce as our allies and our neighbors to the north and south. Furthermore, we are at a continuing disadvantage in dealing with Cuba through a third party, the Swiss Embassy. Cuba without a doubt would become a good customer of the United States. Cubans need American products including medicines, drugs, clothing, beef, and many other nonstrategic products of American farms and factories. We Americans, in turn, would no doubt import Cuban products such as sugar, rum, and fruits produced in the tropics, simply to mention a few. Trade makes for good neighbors. Good neighbors make for peace.

Let us hope that our President and the Secretary of State will propose a diplomatic exchange and take the blinders from our eyes which should have been removed years ago. In fact, should never have been placed there in January 1961 by President Eisenhower less than a month before the end of his term of office.

THE ABM: A NATIONAL DISASTER IN THE MAKING

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, over the past several years I have followed the debate over whether this Nation should build an anti-ballistic-missile system with a deepening sense of unease. I have listened while the voices of our most outstanding scientists and distinguished leaders in the Congress have spoken out against such a system as being not only exorbitantly expensive but also unproven, extremely dangerous to our national security. But even while the anti-

ABM arguments grew more and more cogent and persuasive, the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, in clear violation of his own best judgment, last year advocated that we take the first large steps toward commitment to just such a program. And a majority of the Congress voted to go along.

That decision urgently requires reconsideration and reversal.

If on no other grounds, the near-unanimous testimony of the scientific community should be enough to convince us that the proposed Sentinel ABM system must not be allowed to go forward. Men of such distinguished and proven judgment as Dr. Hans Bethe, Dr. Richard Garwin, Dr. George Kistiakowsky, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, Dr. Herbert York, and indeed, the man who is now President Nixon's chief scientific adviser, Dr. Lee DuBridge—all have expressed the single most compelling argument against our building an ABM system: It will not work; it will not and cannot do the job its proponents claim for it.

The reason is perfectly simple: no conceivable ABM system can successfully intercept a missile attack which has been planned with the knowledge that ABM's are deployed. Through the use of decoys, chaff, radar jamming, and other such devices readily accessible to any nation that has an ICBM capability anyway, incoming missiles can penetrate an ABM shield in sufficient numbers to utterly devastate our industrial and population centers. Our only recourse then would be massive thermonuclear retaliation against the attacking country. But this is precisely the recourse that we now have, without an ABM system. What then will we have gained by building one?

We are told that the so-called thin ABM system now planned is to protect us against a Chinese, not a Soviet, attack. This was Secretary McNamara's painfully reluctant rationale last year in asking us for a \$5 billion authorization. We need only glance at the character of the alleged Chinese threat to see how specious that rationale was and is.

First of all, the hard fact is that the Chinese have not yet even tested a booster rocket powerful enough to use as an ICBM. But after they have done so, it will still require at least 4 years before they can deploy an operational ICBM. Our best available estimates now are that if the Chinese have a successful test during the current year, by the middle or end of the next decade they may have between 25 and 75 ICBMs. These, however, will be similar to our own early Atlas and Titan missiles—that is, liquid-fueled, nonhardened launching sites, and requiring hours to prepare for firing. And even so modest a capability as this is now seriously threatened by the disorder and confusion caused by the so-called cultural revolution and by factional clashes within their defense industry.

We are left, then, Mr. President, with a situation in which, 6 to 10 years from now, the Chinese ICBM capability will be extremely limited in size and technologically obsolescent. It will be of a character that would provide us with a minimum of 12 hours' warning before an ICBM could be launched against U.S. targets—12

hours during which our own Minuteman ICBMs could strike Chinese launching pads in only 30 minutes, and even less time required for a Polaris strike. In short, any remotely probable Chinese ICBM capability developed during the 1970's can be effectively deterred or destroyed prior to launch by existing American weaponry.

There is still another consideration in regard to this not-very-ominous nuclear threat from China. Every responsible observer agrees that the Soviet Union has been effectively deterred by our massive nuclear capability; Soviet leaders are fully aware that any attack on the United States or our principal allies would be countered by its immediate and total devastation of their land and people. But now we are asked to believe that the Chinese, with their far less sophisticated and extensive weapons capability, cannot be deterred in the same fashion. What we are asked to believe, in other words, is that the Chinese leaders are suicidal lunatics. I, for one, Mr. President, politely decline to share so simplistic, indeed, paranoid, a view of the nature of our adversaries.

But the implications of our move toward construction of an ABM system are wider and more serious than these considerations alone would indicate. For the Soviet Union is not, and cannot afford to be, an indifferent observer to any major escalation in our military-strategic capability. Just as we should be forced to respond to any large strategic change in their military posture, they must surely respond to any such change in ours. It is all very well for leaders in this country to proclaim that our building of an ABM system is motivated solely out of concern about China. But if such statements carry so little conviction to so many of us—for the reasons I have just outlined—how much less convincing must they sound to the perennially suspicious and distrustful men in the Kremlin?

More especially today, with a new Secretary of Defense who only a few years ago was insisting that we ought not hesitate to launch a nuclear first strike against the Soviet Union if we thought it in our interest to do so—today, especially, Soviet leaders cannot help but assume that the deployment of an ABM system on our part constitutes a direct threat to themselves. And they will surely respond accordingly.

That response can only be an escalation in the arms race of such proportions as to make previous military spending by either country seem an innocent trifle by comparison. For in addition to what our distinguished majority leader has estimated must be a \$100-billion expenditure on a fully operational ABM system alone, the two superpowers will then have to pour additional numberless billions into devising means of piercing the ABM shield that each will then have. Escalation breeds counterescalation: that is one of the tragic lessons of Vietnam. It is also a lesson that has been borne home to us throughout the entire post-World War II era. To ignore it now is to invite nothing less than an economic and social catastrophe for our beloved country—and in return to guarantee a lot of increased military security.